

REMARKS

New claim 30 is added, hence, claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is believed the Examiner intended to reject claim 29 and not claim 19 since claim 29 recites a computer readable medium of instructions and claim 19 is directed to a method. Claims 14 and 19 are amended and the rejection is believed obviated.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Laiho. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

At page 13 of the Office Action mailed September 12, 2005, the Examiner states that Applicant's arguments distinguishing claims 1-19 and 28-29 from Glass and Laiho individually, are persuasive. The Examiner now purportedly rejects these claims as being obvious. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over Glass and Laiho individually and in combination.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, a link correction service unit configured for "receiving a response indicating a status of the link" and "modifying a document containing the link based on the received response." The present Office Action states that Glass teaches all the limitations in claim 1 except for a "link based on the received response." Laiho is cited for disclosing this limitation at page 7 of the reference.

First, Applicant respectfully points out that the present Office Action indicates that Applicant's remarks in the response to the prior Office Action were persuasive in distinguishing claim 1 from Glass. However, the present Office Action continues to cite the identical portions of Glass for disclosing the features of Claim 1 that Applicant pointed out are not present in Glass. And the present Office Action does not rely on any secondary reference for teaching that missing limitation.

In the previous response, Applicant pointed out that Glass does not teach the limitation in claim 1 of being "configured for determining if a location of a resource ... has changed." See pg. 9 of the Amendment dated June 23, 2005. As stated in the previous response, Glass does not disclose that element since Glass merely discloses that a requestor of a documents may detect a "File Not Found" error. However, such an error does not determine whether a resource has changed, as recited in claim 1. Since Laiho is not cited for disclosing this element of claim 1 it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made and accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not rendered unpatentable.

Second, Applicant respectfully submits that the connection message of Laiho, as asserted in the Office Action, does not teach a service correction unit configured for modifying a "link based on the received response," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action, at page 3 states that Laiho discloses providing "a method for automatically correcting invalid links and providing a 'correction message.'" Presumably, the connection message of Lahio is cited as teaching the claimed "received response." However, it is respectfully submitted that Laiho does not disclose any such automatic correction of invalid links. The "correction" message is sent from the server

(server 8 in Fig. 1) on which an invalid URL resides to the browser (on computer 2) for “notifying the browser that the requested URL is out of date.” The browser then redirects retrieval requests to the new URL. See Laiho at pg. 8. However, it is respectfully submitted that Laiho does not teach that the browser or server 7 modifies the document containing the URL based on the correction message.

Accordingly, even if it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Glass based on Laiho, it is respectfully submitted that the combination would not contain all the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 contain all the limitations of claim 1, and hence, are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 4, 10, 13 and 14

In the present Office Action, although independent claims 4, 10, 13 and 14 are asserted to be rejected as being obvious over Glass in view of Laiho, the Office Action does not specify which limitations of these claims are taught or suggested by Laiho. Since the Examiner agrees that Glass does not teach all the elements of these claims (see pg. 13 of the Office Action) and does not identify how Laiho teaches any missing limitation, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 4, 10, 13 and 14 and the claims that depend therefrom. Applicant incorporates by reference the remarks distinguishing claims 4, 10, 13 and 14 from the prior art that were submitted with the response dated June 23, 2005.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims that depend from claims 4, 10, 13 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reasons as are the claims from which they depend.

Claim 15

In the present Office Action, although independent claim 15 is asserted to be rejected as being obvious over Glass in view of Laiho, the Office Action does not specify which limitations of these claims are taught or suggested by Glass and which by Laiho. It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 15 and the claims that depend therefrom. Applicant incorporates by reference the remarks submitted with the response dated June 23, 2005, distinguishing claim 15 from the prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims that depend from claims 15 are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 15 is patentable.

Claim 22

The Office Action, in numbered paragraph 23, does not state which limitations are taught by Glass and which are taught by Laiho. It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicant incorporates by reference the remarks submitted with the response filed June 23, 2005 which identify the limitations missing from Laiho. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 23-27 contain by reference all the limitations of claim 22 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 28 and 29

As with claims 4, 10 and 13-15 discussed above, the Office Action does not specify the limitations in claims 28 and 29 that are missing from Glass and taught by Laiho. Since the Examiner agrees that Glass does not teach all the elements of these claims (see pg. 13 of the Office Action) and does not indicate how Lahio satisfies those deficiencies, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 28 and 29. Applicant incorporates by reference the remarks submitted with the response dated June 23, 2005, distinguishing claims 28 and 29 from the prior art.

Applicant adds new claim 30, which depends from claim 4, and respectfully submits that it is patentable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Application Number: 10/078,419

Our Ref: A8507
Art Unit: 2145

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.
Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 7, 2005